
**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
MINUTES**

September 4, 2003
9:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
&

September 5, 2003
9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Arizona State Courts Building
Conference Room 345 A & B
1501 West Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMBERS PRESENT

Louraine Arkfeld
Kent Batty
Michael Baumstark
John Pelander sitting in for
J. William Brammer, Jr.
B. Robert Dorfman
Jeanne Hicks
Michael Jeanes
Donna Killoughey
Gary Krcmarik
Martin Krizay
Ruth McGregor
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
James Soto
Sheldon Weisberg

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

GUESTS

John Barrett, TAC
Ron Beguin, TAC, CACC
James Bondurant, TAC
Tom Brady, CACC
Janet Cornell, TAC, CACC
Donna Cross
Dave Davis, TAC, CACC
Daniel Edwards, TAC, CACC
Margaret Guidero, CACC
Will Tagart, TAC
Joan Harphant, TAC
Donald Jacobson, CACC
Kimerlee Johnson, CACC
John King, TAC
Rod Marquardt, PACC
Cary Meister, CACC
Gordon Mulleneaux, CACC
Gregg Obuch, CACC, TAC
Michael Pollard, CACC
Eloice Price, TAC
Carolyn Renzy, Superior Court
of Yuma County
David Stevens
Don Thomas
Jill Woods

AOC STAFF

David Benton
Dave Byers
William Earl
Jennifer Gilbertson
Page Gonzales
Gary Graham
Maureen Haggerty
Jim Ham
Karl Heckart
Paul Hrisho
Tim Lawler
Stephanie Nolan
Pamela Peet
Robert Roll
Janet Scheider
Nancy Swetnam
Paula Taylor
Cindy Trimble
Amy Wood

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Vice Chief Justice Ruth McGregor called the Information Technology Strategic Planning meeting of the Commission on Technology (COT) to order on September 4, 2003 at 9:00 a.m. and welcomed two new members: Chief Judge Sheldon H. Weisberg, Court of Appeals, Division I and Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Court Administrator, Superior Court in Maricopa County. She also welcomed members, staff, and guests present.

Justice McGregor noted that a new agenda item was added relating to a technical amendment of ACJA 1-503, Electronic Communications. The proposal would incorporate new provisions of A.R.S. §38-448 prohibiting state employee access to pornography.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to recommend adding references to A.R.S. §38-448 to subsections B (4), C (4)(d) and D (1)(h) of ACJA 1-503 per the generic draft version. TECH-03-05

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to amend the motion TECH-03-05 to include the words “or printing” after the word “downloading” in C (4) (d). The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-06

NEW LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

AOC Legislative Officer, David Benton presented new legislative proposals with technology impacts. Members discussed the impacts on current technology and infrastructure and provided their recommendations to the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) noting the impacts, benefits and disadvantages of supporting the measures. Outlined below are the proposals covered and the Commission’s remarks and recommendations per proposed legislation.

A. 04-04 Wage Assignment

The proposal gives superior courts and courts of limited jurisdiction authority to order employers to assign wages of persons ordered to pay all fee, fines and restitution.

Commission remarks: Member discussion involved clarifying language as to deferred fees.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded that the Commission on Technology support the 04-04 Wage Assignment proposed legislation. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-07

B. 04-11 MVD Registration Holds

The proposal expands current authority of MVD to refuse vehicle registration for delinquent payments associated with civil and criminal violations.

Commission remarks: Member discussion involved using caution sending the legislation proposed to committees involved and impacted rather than making recommendations on behalf of each committee.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded that the Commission on Technology support the 04-11 proposed legislation allowing felony offenses to qualify for MVD registration holds. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-08

C. 04-12 TIP on location of Probation Absconder

The proposal allows the courts to access the Department of Revenue information in Tax Intercept Program (T.I.P) to locate probation absconders, whether or not the taxpayer is owed a tax refund.

Commission remarks: Member discussion involved the desire to have DOR data be available for all delinquent court obligations and not just probation absconders.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded that the Commission on Technology support legislative proposal 04-12 which allows courts to use state tax return records to locate probation absconders. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-09

Following the legislative proposal presentation, Page Gonzales, AOC Legislative Officer, gave a brief overview of budget issues affecting technology during the last session. She spoke of upcoming events that may impact technology in the courts. Page expected that the next session will be longer, more difficult and have more proposals. Dave Byers noted that the revenue numbers seem to be going up.

PLANNING GOALS AND AGENDA

Justice McGregor outlined the mission, issues and goals for the Commission on Technology's strategic planning meeting. She mentioned the importance of having broad rules and the need for strategies for using and improving technology in the courts. Justice McGregor emphasized financial challenges that were unanticipated during planning sessions in past years and praised the Commission for work completed thus far. She noted that the first day of the meeting would be primarily presentations on background, options, and recommended directions. On the second day, members would make decisions on directions and priorities.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 16, 2003 Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-10

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the April 2, 2003 Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-11

COURT AUTOMATION HISTORY

Karl Heckart, CIO, presented a review of technology and projects in the courts. He provided members of the committee with a history of progress and suggested future directions. He briefed members on the courts' automation history, including early needs, funding, enterprise initiatives and early projects. Karl included details of current projects including ACAP, JOLTS, APETS, EDMS, AJIN, Integration, TIP, Court Financial System (CFS) development, Public Access, Data Warehouse, Appellamtion and various local initiatives. In closing, he pointed out challenges faced with recent funding shortfalls, business/technology alignment and technology obsolescence.

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE (CACC) REPORT

Hon. Michael Pollard, Tucson City Court Judge and Co-Chair of the CACC, presented a report of CACC's positions and priorities. He discussed automation lessons learned, stressing the need for standardizing business rules as a core task in automation implementations. He recommended developing uniform business processes, taking into account the processing differences between Limited and General Jurisdictions, to improve and simplify automation functionality in the courts.

Judge Pollard discussed the systems' lifecycles, reminding the Commission that AZTEC is reaching the end of its lifecycle and becoming obsolete. He then identified replacement options reviewed by CACC. Pointing out both the pros and cons of each option reviewed, he noted that CACC's recommendation would be to go to the market to find a new case management system for limited jurisdiction courts. There was some discussion about the dangers of being dependant upon a vendor.

Kent Batty, Court Administrator, Superior Court in Pima County, added Pima Superior Court's assessment of the business functionality within iCIS, the case management system built in Maricopa Superior Court. He requested that the Commission support Pima Superior Court in moving forward with more detailed gap analysis to determine whether Pima Superior Court should implement iCIS. Judge Pollard closed CACC's report summarizing directions for the future involving funding, the continued priority of the field trainer program and the need for code standardization.

Member discussion revolved around the need for further study of iCIS, particularly the plans for integrating it with the financial module under development, concerns over funding and the need for code and business process standardization.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL (TAC) REPORT

Karl Heckart presented a report of recommendations and issues from TAC. He noted three key technical standard issues reviewed by TAC; statewide architecture standards, electronic/digital signature standards and digital audio transmission standards. He discussed the rationale for adopting such standards, highlighting enterprise leveraging, innovation, process change and a need for stability given our limited resources.

Karl presented a model for distributed development of sharable modules and components that was developed by TAC. He recommended that the Commission direct TAC to continue technical architecture and standards development to maximize sharing, minimize duplicative efforts and coordinate development with robust change management. He further recommended that new development await adoption of such standards.

Karl also discussed current technology initiatives arising from court projects, including the need for an electronic/digital signature standard and a digital audio transmission standard. He recommended that TAC undertake a study to recommend electronic signature solutions. Further, TAC recommends that all digital recording systems acquire the availability to convert to uncompressed WAV formats, and recordings of transferred or appealed cases be sent, minimally, in an uncompressed WAV format.

Justice McGregor added that authority to adopt a single technology architecture lies with the Arizona Judicial Council; Commission action would be a recommendation to AJC for adoption.

PROBATION AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE (PACC) REPORT

Rod Marquardt, Chief Probation Officer in Mohave County and PACC Chair, presented a status report of Adult and Juvenile Probation automation and outlined challenges envisioned in the future with funding and integration needs. He presented the Commission with plans for continued automation and support for both Adult Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS) and Next Generation JOLTS.

He noted that critical action needs to be focused on funding for adult probation automation, development of application architecture standards, establishing a model for statewide application development and support. He recommended the Commission consider the critical nature of funding allocations to enhance, maintain and deploy APETS statewide probation automation system within fiscal year 2005, to request a statewide business and automation standardization and support the development of a new juvenile probation system.

STRATEGIC OPTIONS FOR CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Karl Heckart outlined future directions for court management systems statewide. He summarized the recommendations presented by the CACC, PACC, and TAC subcommittees, detailing how they align with our business process goals. He reviewed the drivers for change as obsolete technology, business re-alignment and costs.

Recommended strategies were highlighted: reconstruct systems with common alignment; reuse rather than rewrite; build with common component assemblies; engineer for flexibility and integration; and, leverage all technologists. He offered the Commission a strategy for a leveraged CMS and presented rough timelines for project completion given the following assumptions: adequate funding, an established architecture, a converted iCIS standard architecture and collaborative development between Maricopa, Pima the Administrative Office of the Courts. Considerable discussion among members and guests involved the difficulty of integrating into one system the distinctively different functions of general and limited jurisdiction and concerns focused around funding, timelines, limited resources and vendor stability.

FINES/FEES AND RESTITUTION ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM (FARE)

Nancy Swetnam, Program Director for the FARE program, provided an overview of the Fines/Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) project. FARE was described as a strategic partnership between the AOC, Affiliated Computer Services Inc. (ACS), local courts and other government agencies. Nancy reinforced the major goal of the program is to enforce court orders thus upholding the integrity of the courts. An important by-product is that court revenues will increase.

Seven courts, Chandler Municipal, Central Phoenix Justice of the Peace, East Phoenix Justice of the Peace, West Phoenix Justice of the Peace, Phoenix Municipal, Tucson Municipal and Showlow Municipal were named as pioneer courts. Joan Harphant, Court Administrator of Tucson Municipal Court, the initial court to rollout fare, gave a brief overview of their experience. In the first week, ACS reported a 97% skip trace hit rate resulting in increases revenue collections for the court. It was also noted that outsourcing the backlog was expected to provide better customer service. Karl Heckart gave a technical overview of the project. He identified a two-phase approach to the rollout of the FARE program and predicted a full-FARE rollout in 2004. The project is designed to be self-funding, with a 19% assessment fee, of which 16% goes to ACS and 3% goes to the courts.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS-JCEF AND TCPF

Karl Heckart briefly reviewed the financial status of the Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund (JCEF) and the Traffic Case Processing Fund (TCPF). He pointed out the impacts of legislative action that reduced the fund annually by \$2 million. Further, revenue growth is shown as flat since House Bill 2533 diverts 75% of quarterly revenue exceeding 2003 quarterly collections to the state general fund. Discussion was deferred until day 2 of the planning session so more detailed information could be given to members in response to several questions.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Day 1 of the strategic planning meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

DISCUSSION OF STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

On September 5, 2003 the Commission on Technology resumed the information technology strategic planning meeting with a more detailed presentation of the financial status of the JCEF and TCPF monies.

Members reviewed and discussed project priorities from the FY 2003-2005 Information Technology Plan, the recommendations made by CACC, TAC and PACC and other factors, projects or directions.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the recommendation made by Technical Advisory Council (TAC) for uncompressed .WAV files as the transfer format of digital audio records. The motion was tabled until more information is available on the impact to the courts using digital recording systems. TECH-03-12

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to charge the Technical Advisory Council (TAC) to research investigate and recommend an e-signature standard to the Commission on Technology. The motion passed. TECH-03-13

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the recommendation by the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) to charge CACC to pursue uniform and simplified financial rules. The motion passed. TECH-03-14

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve adopting a goal of replacing AZTEC as a strategic direction per the recommendation of the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC). The motion passed. TECH-03-15

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve considering adopting a case management system for each level of court (i.e. limited and general jurisdiction), if the business analysis supports it. The motion passed. TECH-03-16

There was considerable discussion on whether a single, modularized system could also address the needs of both levels. The Commission determined that it was premature to determine approaches such as buy, build or re-engineer; therefore, the motion provides only that the technology and business subcommittees pursue these questions and justify any conclusions in their reports.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve no longer having the goal of interfacing the Case Financial System (CFS), now in development, with AZTEC. TECH-03-17

Members discussed that the CFS would first be built stand-alone with the intent that the Maricopa Clerk of Court could use it immediately. Thereafter, an iCIS interface would be completed. Since AZTEC is being considered for replacement, significant efforts to interface it at this time were unnecessary.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to require development and use of standardized codes for general jurisdiction courts (9 months) and limited jurisdiction courts (12 months) before any new case management system implementations. The motion passed. TECH-03-18

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to recommend to the Arizona Judicial Council that the courts develop and use standardized automation-related business processes for general jurisdiction and limited jurisdiction courts before any new case management system implementations. The motion passed. TECH-03-19

There was considerable discussion on whether courts would accept significant process standardization. But members agreed that building or selecting a system to reflect significantly different business processes increased expense and complexity.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to make a rollout of APETS to other probation departments a priority and to use existing limited state resources to rollout APETS statewide than expand APETS functionality. The motion passed with 11-2 with 1 abstention. TECH-03-20

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to adopt enterprise architecture standards for a bolt-on/core approach as outlined in presentations and the “Bolt-On Matrix” handout. The motion passed with 12-2. TECH-03-21

There was discussion of freezing any new initiative development through January 2004 while the architecture is being developed. The group opted to not apply such a freeze to all development.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to authorize Pima Superior Court to pursue iCIS implementation. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-22

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to begin development of one new JOLTS system based on an adopted enterprise architecture. The motion was tabled awaiting a report in January on an enterprise architecture recommendation. TECH-03-23

Maricopa Superior Court technology staff noted that any work on a new JOLTS system was not scheduled to begin until January; therefore, having the provision to hold on development until then was not burdensome. It was noted that TAC must meet its goal of recommending an enterprise architecture by that time.

A prioritization of the projects and goals was requested of members to be included in the strategic plan for FY 2004-2006. The new and existing initiatives in order of priority as assigned by the Commission are:

Initiative	Score*	Rank
New Court Financial System (CFS)	4.6	1
Code Standardization	4.4	2
Penalty Enforcement Program (and FARE)	4.1	3
Financial Rule Uniformity/Simplification	3.9	4
Adult Probation System (APETS) Rollout	3.6	5
Electronic Document Management	3.6	5
Enterprise Architecture	3.6	5
Integration	3.6	5
New Case Management System for General Jurisdiction Courts	3.6	5
New Case Management System for Limited Jurisdiction Courts	3.6	5
Next Generation Juvenile Probation System (JOLTS)	3.5	6
Public Access	3.1	7
Technical Training	3.1	7
Process Standardization	2.7	8
Web Presence	2.7	8
APETS Enhancements	2.6	9
Electronic Filing	2.6	9
Audio and Video Court Records	2.5	10
Electronic Signatures	2.4	11
Interactive Jury	1.9	12
Video Hearings/Arraignments	1.9	12

*Based on members assigning a priority value of highest (5) to lowest (1) to each item.

Systemic thinking, on-going support and maintenance of core applications, infrastructure maintenance, and automation training and support remain priorities.

FINANCIAL AND TACTICAL DECISIONS

Members of the Commission applied the priorities and guidelines agreed upon in during the discussion of strategic directions and made JCEF/TCPF funding or approval recommendations on the following statewide projects:

- Pima Country Superior Court request for State JCEF funding of 100PCs.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima Superior Court's request for State JCEF funding of desktops per the large volume court formula. The motion passed 10 to 3 with 1 abstention. TECH-03-24

- Court of Appeals, Division 1 request for State JCEF funding for 2 deputy clerk positions.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Court of Appeals, Division I request for state funding of staff positions for one year for a total of \$59, 237.81. The motion passed 7 to 6 with 1 abstention. TECH-03-25

Members noted that their grant to the Court of Appeals was an exception and not meant to set a precedent since in the past state funding of operational personnel was not provided, per COT's informal policy.

STATEWIDE STRATEGIC PLANS

The Commission reviews Information Technology plans annually per Arizona Code of Judicial Administration 1-109.A.7. Karl Heckart presented members with a summary of each Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006 submitted by county courts and appellate courts. He indicated trends, priorities, local drivers and technology projects, while noting concerns over any conflicts with strategic technology directions that COT has approved. Members reviewed each plan's key directions and projects and recommended approval, approval with stipulations, or a decline of approval. It was noted that general approval of IT Plans did not constitute approval of specific projects that may require additional information and clarification. Further, where concern was raised, staff will communicate to the court the issues raised.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Apache County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006 with a concern raised for duplicative projects. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-26

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Cochise County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-27

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Coconino County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-28

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Gila County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-29

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Graham County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-30

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Greenlee County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-31

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve La Paz County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-32

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan including Maricopa Municipal Court Plans for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-33

- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Mohave County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-34
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Navajo County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-35
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Pima County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-36
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Pinal County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-37
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Santa Cruz County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-38
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Yavapai County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-39
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve Yuma County Courts Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006 with the expectation they will reassess on-line payments to avoid duplicative projects. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-40
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the Arizona Supreme Court Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-41
- MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve the Court of Appeals, Division I and II, Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2004-2006. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-42

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

There were no respondents to the call to the public.

Justice McGregor thanked members of the Commission for their hard work and dedication in the strategic planning process.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.